

Curriculum Council

7 March 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: SA/CD

Art :

This is a very good paper. I had occasion to review it with Bob Wattles and Harry Fisher today. They felt too, I think, that we are definitely headed in the right direction and their observations are few. One of the first ones they made was that our profile of courses and specifically of the core should be considered as guidance and that almost each office--but certainly each Directorate--should probably define its own peculiar profile. Could you crank something into the paper along these lines?

We have pending from Mr. Colby several observations regarding first, the need to crank some management principles, particularly those of leadership, into our more popular courses or core training; and secondly, at the same time he has evinced quite an interest in the incorporation of at least orientation on ADP and innovative technological advances in the handling of the information sciences. Could you likewise make brief references to these requirements and the fact that we will be incorporating at appropriate levels information in these fields.

Generally, I wonder if the paper really examines the relationship between training and its value. It may be more appropriate to say that this paper concerns itself with that problem.

I think that paragraph 3 ought to be called something other than apperception or the beginning of maturing.

On page 5, obviously we must state the difference between management and other courses in some terms other than mind-stretching or at least not exclude the managerial field as having mind-stretching qualities.

I think that on page 8 Harry Fisher and company--if you would like to call there--could give you some help on answering how many GS-14s were in fact promoted in 1971.